DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 581 CE 002 669

AUTHOR Schein, Edgar H.
TITLE Career Anchors and Career Paths: A Panel Study of Management School Graduates. Technical Report No. 1.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts Inst. of Tech., Cambridge. Alfred P. Sloan School of Management.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Naval Research, Washington, D.C. Organizational Effectiveness Research Program.
PUB DATE May 74
NOTE 36p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Careers; Creativity; *Followup Studies; Job Satisfaction; Management; Management Development; *Managerial Occupations; *Motivation; Occupational Surveys; *Organizations (Groups); Performance; Personal Values; Question Answer Interviews; Self Actualization; Tables (Data); Technology; Vocational Development; *Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Career Anchors

ABSTRACT

The first of a series, this report describes a 10-year followup study of a sample of 44 graduates of the Sloan School of Management, analyzing the interaction of personal values and career events in the lives of managers in organizations. All 44 participants were located, interviewed, and given the same attitude surveys as in the early 1960's. This particular report deals with those results pertaining to the "career anchor" concept, a motivational/attitudinal/value syndrome which guides and constrains an individual's career and reflects both individual and societal influences. Five basic career anchors were defined from the point of view of participants in the study: (1) managerial competence, (2) technical/functional competence, (3) organizational security, (4) creativity, and (5) autonomy. Although formal titles or career paths may appear overtly similar, important differences may exist in the anchors of career occupants. Classification into career anchor groups was on the basis of reasons for career choice, reasons for job moves, and objectives in life. The concept of career anchor was found to be a viable categorization method. Implications for the concept of career anchors are the early identification of these syndromes and the creating of congruent career opportunities. (EA)

ED 099581

JAN 22 1975

Technical Report No. 1

Career Anchors and Career Paths:

A Panel Study of Management School Graduates

Edgar H. Schein

Organization Studies Group

Sloan School of Management, M.I.T.

May 1974

707-74

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Research has been supported by the Organizational Effectiveness Research Program of the Office of Naval Research under Contract No. N00014-67-A-0204-0073.

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

CE002669

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER: Technical Report No. 1	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle): Career Anchors and Career Paths: A Panel Study of Management School Graduates		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED: Tech. Report, Feb. '73-Apr '74 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s): Edgar H. Schein		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s): N00014-67-A-0204-0073
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS: Sloan School of Management, M.I.T. Cambridge, Mass. 02139		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS: NR 170 753
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS: ONR (Code 452)		12. REPORT DATE: May, 1974 13. NUMBER OF PAGES: 27
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report): Unclassified 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Career Studies
Career Paths
Career Dynamics
Career Anchors
Management Career

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

This report describes a 10 year follow-up study of a sample of 44 graduates of the Sloan School of Management. A set of career anchors is conceptualized to describe the career dynamics of these men and some correlates of the career anchors are identified. This is the first of a series of reports of this study.

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
S/N 0102-014-6601

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Career Anchors and Career Paths: A Panel Study of Management School Graduates

Edgar H. Schein

Sloan School of Management, M.I.T.

A. Introduction

A panel study of 44 Sloan School of Management alumni was launched in 1961 in order to study the interaction of personal values and career events in the lives of managers in organizations. The original purpose of the study was to determine the mechanisms and effects of organizational socialization--in what manner and through what means would the values of our students be influenced by their organizational experiences? Would certain sets of individuals with certain sets of values be more or less socialized? Could one determine what kinds of value syndromes would lead to careers in which the individual would innovate, i.e. would change organizations rather than be changed by them?

In order to answer these questions we selected a panel to be studied prior to graduation and at various points during their subsequent careers. A major re-interview and re-survey of the panel was completed in 1973-74. All 44 panelists were located, interviewed, and given the same attitude surveys as in the early 1960's. The present report deals with one aspect of the results. It was found that each of the panelists could be understood best in terms of a concept of "career anchor" -- a motivational/attitudinal/value syndrome which guides and constrains the person's career. This report spells out this concept, classifies the panelists into groups based on different anchors, and reports some correlates of these groupings. In subsequent reports we will spell out

other aspects of our findings of the project such as value changes observed.

B. The panel study procedure

1. Selection of the panel. Once a panel study had been decided upon in early 1960, it was important to avoid as much as possible whatever biases might be inherent in people's volunteering for such a study. Therefore, we took an entire class list for each year, 1961, 1962, 1963, and selected 15 names at random from that list. Prior to that selection we eliminated certain categories of students: a)foreign students; b) students who were going to be drafted or enter the military shortly after graduation; and c) students who were going directly into a Ph.D. program following graduation. Once we had located 15 names, we sent an invitation to each of those students to participate in the study. If he refused, we selected another name at random until we had 15 acceptances. This process could have introduced bias if there had been a large number of refusals, but in each class we had to replace only one or two people. It is quite likely, therefore, that the panelists are reasonably representative of the graduating classes from which they were drawn. We ended up with 15 members of the class of 1961, 15 members of the class of 1962, and 14 members of the class of 1963, because of one person dropping the study at a point where it was too late to replace him.

The entire process described above was completed in the fall term of the students' second year of their two-year masters program. The spring term was devoted to the actual interviews and survey procedures.

2. Initial data gathering. Each panelist was interviewed for two or three hours. The interview covered his educational and occupational history, the origins of his interests in business/management, his plans for the future, his ambitions, his work values, his self-concept, and any other information

pertinent to unravelling the value syndromes which were operating in the person. In addition, each panelist took two to three hours worth of specially designed attitude and value questionnaires in order to permit us to assign numerical scores to each person's values and attitudes as a baseline for future studies. Details of this procedure will be spelled out in future papers dealing with attitude and value changes. Suffice it to say for the present purpose that we tried to get as complete a picture of each person's attitudes and values in relation to his career as we could, and we tried to obtain such data prior to any concrete decisions about where or in what kind of job the person would be working.

3. Re-interviews and re-surveys. The first major post-graduation data gathering occurred one year following graduation. The purpose was to obtain information about the problems of entry into careers. Results have been partially reported in a number of prior publications (Schein, 1962; 1963; 1964). We did not observe major changes or critical career events which seemed to be tied specifically to panelists' attitudes and values, hence did not undertake a major data analysis at that time. Instead, we decided to keep close track of the panel so that we could re-study them at a later time.

After approximately three to five years into their career (depending upon which class we were referring to), we sent a brief questionnaire dealing with career history and a set of the attitude and value surveys to all the panel members. Those data were analyzed and recorded, but not reported in any technical or other reports.

In the spring of 1973 major plans were made for a personal follow-up which would include a complete interview at MIT, followed by a re-taking of the attitude and value questionnaires. Such interviews were conducted throughout the summer and fall. All 44 men were successfully located and all of them

agreed to visit MIT for at least a half day. Interviews again took from two to three hours and covered in considerable detail the career history since graduation, perceptions of the present and future, changes a person saw in himself, relations between work concerns, family concerns, and self-concerns, and reactions to some feedback based on the original interviews. We had made rather careful analyses of the major value themes which were reflected in the original interview but had never given any of those data to the panel members. At this 10 to 12 years out point, I decided that such feedback could not bias the data too much, hence told each person what we had seen in his interview back in graduate school. This feedback was given at the very end of the interview and the person was asked how he felt about it, whether it sounded true, whether it suggested new thoughts about how he had changed or not changed, etc. In most cases this discussion led to some important new insights which had previously not come out. At the end of the interview we also gave each panelist a copy of his original interview transcript in order to give him further feedback. None of the quantitative results have as yet been fed back to participants, but once they are analyzed we will be giving them profiles of their scores as well as group averages.

4. Data analysis. The present paper is based on data obtained in the re-interviews. Each interview was tape-recorded, but in addition careful notes were kept around the career history, the reasons for movement, attitudes, and values, etc. At the end of each interview I dictated a summary based on the notes. These summaries run approximately two to four pages single-spaced and serve as the prime data until such time as the interviews are fully transcribed. The ratings of career anchors which will be reported below are based upon a careful analysis of the interview notes and interview summary. Quantitative analyses of the attitude and value survey data are under way, but have not yet been completed.

5. A note on validity. It should be pointed out that one of the reasons for undertaking a panel study of a small sample, in the first place, was to insure a close enough relationship between me and the panelists to be able to elicit full cooperation from them. I invested considerable energy at the outset of the study in getting to know the panelists and establishing an easy open relationship with them. Their involvement in the study grew as they invested in it and became curious about their own and their peers' careers. I felt in the 1960's that I was getting a pretty accurate picture of where each panelist stood, insofar as he was able to articulate his position, and I felt that the contact over the years had been a worthwhile investment because of the ease of picking up the relationship in the re-interviews. Each of the panelists seemed relaxed, glad to have come to MIT, anxious to tell about himself and his career, and quite frank about problems, concerns, etc. Several of the panelists had experienced marital difficulties and personal difficulties requiring psychiatric aid. There seemed to be no hesitation on their part in sharing those data with me. On the whole, therefore, I have reasonable confidence that the picture I obtained from each person was about as accurate as he himself could make it. In every case the individual said that it had been an exciting and valuable experience to talk about himself and his career and life in such great detail. The implications of that point for career counseling or the lack thereof within organizations should be noted.

C. Developing a Taxonomy of Careers--the Concept of Career Anchors

In order to understand clearly how values either determine or are determined by career experiences, it was essential to develop a typology or taxonomy of career paths which reflected important dimensions of the career. The career can

be thought of as a set of stages or a path through time which reflects two things: 1) the individual's needs, motives, and aspirations in relation to work, and 2) society's expectations of what kinds of activities will result in monetary and status rewards for the career occupant. In other words, work careers reflect both individual and societal definitions of what is a worthwhile set of activities to pursue throughout a lifetime.

In delineating career types within a given broad occupational category like "business" or "management", it is necessary to remember this dual basis for defining the career. Most of the labels one encounters to describe careers reflect only societal or organizational definitions in the form of occupational or positional labels such as supervisor, manager of marketing, executive vice-president, etc. We will use a somewhat broader set of categories which also reflect the individual's subjective view of what his job is and how he relates to it.

In a sense one can speak of two sets of "anchors" of a career. On the one hand, it is anchored in a set of job descriptions and organizational norms about the rights and duties of a given title in an organization. The "head of production" is expected to perform certain duties, he carries certain sets of responsibilities, he is held accountable for certain areas of organizational performance. On the other hand, the career is anchored in a set of needs and motives which the career occupant is attempting to fulfill through the work he does and the rewards he obtains for that work--money, prestige, organizational membership, challenging work, freedom, etc. The rewards he seeks can be thought of as his job values--what he is looking for in a job. These values reflect an underlying pattern of needs which the individual is trying to fulfill. Thus, as "head of production", he may be trying to exercise his basic need for influencing and controlling a wide number of people and resources, or he may be

trying to meet the challenge of successfully building something or getting something accomplished which is a proof of his competence. Motivational typologies such as those of Maslow or McClelland are useful in categorizing the kinds of underlying needs which serve as career anchors. For some people, it is achievement or accomplishment per se, a drive toward competence; for others it is the exercise of a certain talent such as quantitative analysis; and for still others it is a need to find security--to link oneself with a stable and predictable future via an occupation or an organization. The drive for money, as many previous analyses have shown, is difficult to unravel because of the many meanings which money has for people. For some it is a means of achieving security, for some it is an evidence of a social or an occupational status achieved, for some it is a means of exercising power, and for some it is simply a measure of how well they are doing. A drive for money often masks an underlying need, and our categories must attempt to take the underlying need into account.

The 44 interviews reveal a number of common themes in what people are fundamentally looking for in their careers. These common themes will be defined for purposes of our study as the underlying individual career anchors. Such anchors function to pull the person back if he strays too far from what he really wants. It is the conservative, stable part of his personality that generates the career anchor. Therefore, we would not expect much change in career anchors even though one might see continued movement in the overt manifestations of careers as the person searches for appropriate settings within which to fulfill his needs.

Anchor 1. Managerial Competence: A number of the respondents make it very clear that their fundamental motivation is to be competent in the complex set of activities which make up the idea of "management." The most important

components of this concept are 1) interpersonal competence--the ability to influence, supervise, lead, manipulate, and control people toward the more effective achievement of organizational goals; 2) analytical competence in the identification and solving of conceptual problems under conditions of uncertainty and incomplete information; and 3) emotional stability--the capacity to be stimulated by emotional and interpersonal crises rather than exhausted or debilitated by them, and the capacity to bear high levels of responsibility. The person who wants to rise in the organization, who is seeking higher and higher levels of responsibility must, in other words, be good in handling people, an excellent analyst, and emotionally able to withstand the pressures and tensions of the "executive suite." This kind of person "needs" to be a manager in the sense of needing opportunities to express the combination of interpersonal, analytical and emotional talents delineated above. In terms of organizational categories he is usually thought of as a line manager or a general manager depending upon his rank. Occasionally a senior functional manager fits this concept if he is getting his prime satisfaction from managing rather than from the technical part of his job.

Anchor 2. Technical-Functional Competence. A number of respondents make it very clear that what motivates them in their career is the challenge of the actual work they are doing--whether that work be financial analysis, marketing, systems analysis, corporate planning, or some other area related to business or management. What distinguishes this group from the previous one is that the anchor is the technical field or functional area, not the managerial process per se. If the person has supervisory responsibility, he is usually supervising others in the same technical area as he, and he makes it clear that it is the area, not the supervising which turns him on. This kind of person is not interested in being promoted out of the technical area he is in; his roots

are in the actual analytical work he is doing. In terms of organizational titles such people are spread over a wide range of functional managers, technical managers, senior staff, junior staff, and some external consultants, etc. People with this set of needs will leave a company rather than be promoted out of their technical/functional area.

Anchor 3. Security. A number of respondents have tied their career to particular organizations. Though one must infer it, it is reasonable to assume that the underlying need is insecurity and that the person is seeking to stabilize his career by linking it to a given organization. The implications are that he will accept to a greater degree than the other types, an organizational definition of his career. Whatever private aspirations or competence areas the individual may have had, he must increasingly rely upon the organization to recognize such needs and competencies and to do the best by him that is possible. But he has lost some degrees of freedom because of his unwillingness to leave a given organization if his needs or talents should go unrecognized. Instead, he must begin to rationalize that the organization's definition of his career is indeed the only valid definition.

If such an individual has technical/functional talent he may rise to a senior functional manager level; but if part of his psychological make-up is a degree of insecurity, that very insecurity is likely to make him "incompetent" with respect to higher levels of management where emotional security and stability become prime requisites for effective performance. It should be noted that length of time with a given organization is not a sufficient criterion for defining this career anchor. One must know something of the reasons why an individual has remained with a given organization before one can judge whether it is insecurity or a pattern of constant success

which is operating. By the same logic, we do find some individuals who are security oriented yet who are moving from one company to another. In such cases we typically can observe that there are strong similarities between the types of companies and the types of career slots which the individual exchanges. For example, in one Subject, the pattern of seeking security and stability expressed itself partly in seeking to remain in a given community where the Subject and his family were very happy. Over a period of years this person switched companies three times, but in each case picked a similar company and was willing to start in that new company at an equal or lower level in terms of rank. He is clearly willing to sacrifice some of his autonomy in the career in order to stabilize his total life situation.

Anchor 4. Creativity. A number of respondents have expressed a strong need to create something of their own. This is the fundamental need operating in the entrepreneur and it expresses itself in the desire to invent a new business vehicle, find a new product, develop a new service, or in some other way create something new which can be clearly identified with the individual. In our sample, we can clearly see that the need has varied outlets--one person has become a successful purchaser, restorer and renter of town houses in a large city; one person has developed a string of financial service organizations which use the computer in new and more effective ways in a region of the country where such services were not available; this person is also purchasing and developing large tracts of land and is currently co-owner of of a large cattle ranch; one person is operating within a corporate framework taking a new protein product and organizing the marketing, production, and sales of that product in several countries in the Far East and South America; one person is looking for products which he feels he could successfully

manufacture, operating as free-lance consultant while he is searching; finally, one person acquired a good deal of capital through some fortunate stock transactions, used his money to buy and set up a small manufacturing firm which he subsequently sold, and is currently looking for other products to develop while operating as a salesman and distributor of sail boats. One of the people, the real estate dealer, is also a general manager and his drive to manage probably supercedes his creative needs.

One gets the impression that the creativity/entrepreneurial pattern is also closely related to the next one to be discussed--the need for autonomy and independence. All of the entrepreneurs strongly express the desire to be on their own and free of organizational constraints; but the decisive fact about them is that they have not left the world of business to achieve their autonomy. Instead they have chosen to try to express their business and managerial skills through building their own enterprises. The commitment to business shows up in the manner in which this group expresses its ambitions-they want a great deal of money. But the money is not sought for its own sake or for what it will buy--only one of the people mentioned above lives in an opulent fashion. Instead, one gets the distinct impression that total financial assets is a measure that the person uses to define his degree of success as an entrepreneur. The strong urge to be on one's own is probably related to the need to be able to attribute one's success to one's own efforts. There is a degree of self-centeredness or narcissism in the entrepreneurs combined with a strong sense of security, self-confidence, and analytical skill. They vary greatly in the degree to which they possess interpersonal competence, but all of them have some capacity to influence others.

Anchor 5. Autonomy and Independence. A number of respondents are primarily concerned about their own sense of freedom and autonomy. They have found organizational life to be restrictive, irrational, and or intrusive into their

own private life. They have left the world of business altogether, seeking careers that have more autonomy associated with them, or they have become consultants operating on their own. One of the respondents has become a University Professor in areas related to business; one person is a free-lance writer who not only has rejected business as an arena, but has rejected the success ethic which he associates with it. For him it has become more important to develop himself--he lives very frugally working as a ghost writer when he needs the money, travels, and works on his creative writing when the mood strikes him. Among the consultants in our sample we find several people who are clearly there because of needs for autonomy, but not all consultants have that need. We have previously noted that some consultants are motivationally entrepreneurs; some are technical/functional specialists who have found that they can pursue their line of work best as a consultant; and some are in transition toward a managerial position. The last named group have been managerially oriented all along but find that a period of time in management consulting provides much needed experience and contacts. For them consulting is a transitional role rather than a career alternative.

Summary.

We have tried to define five basic career anchors from the point of view of the individuals in our panel study--1) managerial competence; 2) technical/functional competence; 3) organizational security; 4) creativity; and 5) autonomy. In practice there is of course some overlap in that any given individual is anchored more than in one area. But, for most of our respondents it is possible to identify one major anchor which seems to be the guiding force in their career.

D. The relation of career anchors to occupational/organizational titles

Career anchors are personal motivational/attitudinal/value syndromes. What the person wants to become competent in or what he is seeking out of his career will not necessarily be reflected in the occupational or organizational titles which he holds. Indeed, one of the important results of this study is to recognize that formal titles or career paths which are overtly similar may reflect important differences in what the career occupants are anchored to. Each panelist was classified into one of the career anchor groups on the basis of his present interview. I took into account any statements of what he was looking for in his work, his explanations of why he moved from job to job or company to company, his view of his present level of success and aspirations for the future, and any other indicator. I did not use any prior data in making the present rating of career anchors. Most of the cases were very easy to categorize. In a few cases it appeared that the person had more than one anchor creating a forced choice situation. However, the number of such difficult cases was no more than 5 out of the 44.*

-Insert Table 1 here-

As can be seen from the table, the bulk of the panelists are anchored in technical/functional competence. That is, their major concern in developing their career is that they be able to continue the kind of work which they enjoy and are apparently good at. We should not assume from this kind of grouping of people that others are less concerned about developing their

* An independent set of ratings to check for reliability will be made when the transcripts are completed. However, the major theoretical arguments underlying the concepts of career anchors will, in any case, not be affected by misclassifying a few cases. Only when we attempt to generalize from the groups will we have to be cautious.

Table 1

Job Titles and Organizational Membership of Panelists in Different Career Anchor Groups

Anchor 1--Managerial Competence

1.1 (1961) Manager of Factoring Systems; Corporate Hq's, large financial corp.

1.2 (1961) Sales Manager and Part Owner; Family furniture business

1.3 (1961) Sales Manager; Industrial Foods Division, large conglomerate

1.4 (1962) Senior Vice President; Media Services, large advertising firm

1.5 (1963) President and Part Owner, Small manufacturing firm

1.6 (1963) Manager of Marketing and Assistant to General Manager, large division of large corporation

1.7 (1963) Director of Administration; Insurance Services Division of large financial corporation

1.8 (1963) Vice President for Finance and Administration; Medium size service organization

Anchor 2--Technical/Functional Competence

2.1 (1961) Manager of Data Processing and Part Founder; large consulting R & D firm

2.2 (1961) Research Associate to Vice-President for Academic Affairs, medium size university

2.3 (1961) Director of Corporate Plan Administration; large airline

2.4 (1961) Director of Required Earnings Studies; large national utility

2.5 (1961) Manager of Engineering; Large product line of medium size manufacturing company

2.6 (1961) Member of Technical Staff; R & D division of large national utility

2.7 (1961) Principal Programmer; Technical unit of large systems design and manufacturing company

2.8 (1961) Market Development Engineer; New venture group, Chemical corporation

2.9 (1962) Project Manager; Aero-space division of large electronics corporation

2.10 (1962) Treasurer; Small growth company

2.11 (1962) Commerce Officer; Large government department, Canadian government

2.12 (1962) Assistant Professor of Operations Research; Management department, U.S. Naval Academy

2.13 (1962) Senior Consultant; small management consulting firm

2.14 (1963) Assistant Director; White House Office of Telecommunications

2.15 (1963) Plant Manufacturing Engineer; Large consumer products division of large corporation

2.16 (1963) Manager, Market Support Systems, Europe; Information Services Division of large corporation

2.17 (1963) Teacher and Department Head; Regional rural Canadian high school

2.18 (1963) Project Supervisor; Technical division of large chemical company

2.19 (1963) Director, Cost Analysis Group; Large technical systems consulting firm

2.20 (1963) Principal; Large management consulting firm

Anchor 3--Organizational Security

3.1 (1961) Manager, Forward Product Planning Research; Large automobile company

3.2 (1962) Marketing Sales Representative; large data services company

3.3 (1962) Advisory Marketing Representative; large computer manufacturing corporation

3.4 (1963) Chief Engineer; Small family steel fabricating company

Anchor 4--Creativity

4.1 (1961) Founder of several financial, service, and real estate businesses

4.2 (1961) Founder of one firm and developer of second firm in chemical industry

4.3 (1962) Marketing Development Staff; Overseas development of new ventures for industrial protein products of large consumer co.

4.4 (1962) Marketing Consultant; self-employed, searching for new enterprises to buy or develop (one previous unsuccessful venture)

4.5 (1963) President and Co-Founder; planning and consulting firm

Anchor 5--Autonomy and Independence

5.1 (1961) Senior Consultant; small management consulting firm

5.2 (1962) Communication Consultant; self-employed, looking for entrepreneurial opportunity in communications field

5.3 (1962) Proprietor and Owner of retail hardware and wholesale pumping equipment business

5.4 (1962) Assistant Professor of Business and Economics; Regional campus of a large state university system

5.5 (1962) Self-employed Consultant; Operations Research field emphasizing applications to health care

5.6 (1963) Senior Consultant; Specializing in taxation work, large accounting firm

5.7 (1963) Self employed free lance writer

career is that they be able to continue the kind of work which they enjoy and are apparently good at. We should not assume from this kind of grouping of people that others are less concerned about developing their expertise or care less about the kind of work they do. What we are saying is that in each person one can find a predominant concern which will function as an anchor in the sense of pulling the person back if he strays too far from fulfilling that concern. Thus, a person in the autonomy group (e.g. a professor) is certainly concerned about his area of specialization and certainly wants to be good at it. But his career is not necessarily anchored in that concern. If he were given a chance to pursue that line of work in a large organization at a much higher salary and with much better equipment or resources, he would not take the opportunity if he viewed that organizational setting as one in which he would have to sacrifice his autonomy. It is the autonomy need which is the true anchor in that case.

Eight out of the 44 panelists are anchored in managerial competence. Not all of them have made it to higher levels of management, but their interviews clearly indicate that it is those higher levels which they are seeking, and that they get their primary satisfactions out of managerial activity per se. Within the group we can note two career patterns: 1) working one's way up within large organizations (subjects 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, and 1.7); and 2) seeking larger jobs within smaller organizations (subjects 1.2, 1.5, and 1.8). In both groups there are individuals who have moved from company to company and who have sometimes interrupted the pattern with stints in management consulting. But in the former group, the individual always ended up in another large organization, while in the latter group there was a clear decision to move toward smaller organizations, in one case a family business. Only

one man has made it to the level of general manager (7.5) but the others are clearly striving in that direction.

In the technical/functional competence group we have a great variety of organizational titles and career paths. The commonest of these is middle level functional or technical management (11 people); next most common is senior or middle level staff roles (5 people); two people are in straight consulting roles; and two people are in teaching, one at unversity one at high school level. It must be remembered that if the concept of career anchor is valid, these 20 people are not in transition toward managerial roles per se. They may rise within functional/technical management ladders, but the theoretical assumption is that they would refuse to be promoted into a role which would entail giving up the kind of work they are presently doing.

Many of the panelists in this group sense that they are violating the "success ethic" of the business world and feel somewhat conflicted and guilty over their lack of ambition and success. They talk of their work and their family as being really important, and they say that they enjoy their present life, but they wonder whether they are missing something, whether they are doing as well as their peers, etc. As one man puts it, "is it better to jump into a fast moving river to see whether or not you can swim in it, or is it better to wade around in a slow moving stream--safer but less exciting?" Our prediction would be that none of these men will move out of their present orientation but that they will have to find ways of dealing with their conflicts about what they feel they may be giving up.

Only four people could be classified as security oriented per se. Three of these people have spent the bulk of their career within a single organization; one of them has moved frequently but it had always been within the same geographical area and the moves had always been

into similar types of jobs (with one exception--an abortive venture into trying to start up a company with a group of others). These men talk of their work, their family, their overall satisfaction with a geographical area with which they have settled, and their sense of having achieved enough to satisfy them. The one man who is in the family business had been in a large corporation before moving back into the family business, is not entirely happy with his present situation, and may move back into the large corporation in a fairly junior level. Such a move would not concern him so long as he remained in his present home town where he has made a well ordered life for himself.

The group concerned with creativity is the most interesting in that it contains the entrepreneurs. Four of these men are successful in that they have been able to launch enterprises which have succeeded and have brought to their founders either fame or fortune or both. The kinds of activities represented vary greatly--but they all have in common that they are clear extensions of the person and his identity is heavily involved in the vehicle which is created. It should be noted that in this group we could also have put one of the managers who has launched a whole series of successful real estate ventures while pursuing his managerial job in the advertising agency. He was classified under managerial competence because of our judgment that, in the end, it is that which truly "turns him on" or he would have left the advertising business and devoted his full attention to his extra-curricular enterprises.

Finally, in the autonomy group, we have four consultants, one owner/proprietor of a small business, one professor, and one free lance writer. In many respects this group resembles the technical/functional competence group except that there are no functional managers or staff roles represented in it.

What clearly distinguishes the autonomy group is that there is little conflict about missed opportunities or failure to aspire higher. All of these people are very happy with what they are doing and are truly enjoying their freedom. All of them feel that they need to be on their own, to have a sense of their own professionalism, and to be able to link the results of their work to their own efforts(a feeling which they share with the "creativity" group). It is not easy to differentiate the autonomy from the creativity group on the surface because the entrepreneurs also enjoy a great deal of autonomy and freedom. However, when one listens to the entrepreneurs it is the building of something which clearly pre-occupies them most; whereas with the autonomy group it is the need to be on their own and free of constraints which pre-occupies them most. The autonomy group is not concerned with making money or building empires--only with feeling competent and free in whatever they are doing.

Summary

Thus far we have identified the concept of career anchors, have described the five major anchors which emerged in the study, and have classified the 44 panelists into five groupings. We found 8 people concerned with managerial competence, 20 who are concerned with technical/functional competence, 4 who are security oriented, 5 who are concerned with creativity, and 7 who are concerned with autonomy. We have described the kinds of organizational roles which they occupy. In the next portion of the paper we will explore some of the characteristics of each of these groupings in an effort to understand better the origins and consequences of particular career anchors.

E. Some background characteristics of different "anchor" groups

1. Grade Point Average and Business Aptitude Test Scores. One obvious factor to be related to the different groups identified above is intellectual aptitude and performance. We can compare groups that have in common a given career anchor on undergraduate grade point average, the verbal and quantitative scores on the Admissions Test for Graduate Study in Business (ATGSB), and grade point average while at MIT (see Table 2).

--Insert Table 2 about here--

Because the numbers are extremely small for statistical comparison, we will be more concerned with the consistency of the results than the absolute differences in GPA and test scores. In terms of undergraduate GPA it is the managerial and technical/functional groups which have the highest grades, while the creativity group clearly has the lowest grades. In terms of aptitude, as measured by the ATGSB, it is the autonomy group that shows up with the highest scores, both in the verbal and quantitative areas, while the creativity group again shows the lowest scores. In terms of GPA at MIT, the groups resemble each other closely except for the lower average of the creativity group. The two salient features in the results are the consistent low performance of the creativity group and the very high aptitude test score of the autonomy group. To highlight this difference we show in Table 3 the ATGSB scores of the two extreme groups--note that they are virtually non-overlapping distributions, and that all but one of the autonomy group falls above the total group mean of 587, while all but one of the creativity groups falls below the group mean.

--Insert Table 3 about here--

TABLE 2

Undergraduate Grade Point Average, Business Aptitude Test Scores and Graduate Grade Point Average of Career Anchor Groups

CAREER ANCHOR	U.G. G.P.A.	ATGSB TOTAL	VERBAL	QUANT.	GRAD. G.P.A.
MANAGERIAL COMP. (N=8)	4.0	578	30	38	4.3
TECH./FUNCT. COMP. (N=20)	3.9	590	34	38	4.2
SECURITY (N=4)	3.7	573	31	38	4.2
CREATIVITY (N=5)	3.2	543	29	36	4.0
AUTONOMY (N=7)	3.5	628	37	41	4.2
TOTAL	3.9	587	33	38	4.2

TABLE 3

RANKING of ATGSB Scores of Creativity and Autonomy Groups

RANK	AUTONOMY	CREATIVITY
1	680	
2	670	
3	657	
4	615	
5		611
6	607	
7	594	
8	576	
9		551
10		535
11		526
12		494

One can conjecture that the entrepreneurs probably learned early in life (high school and before) that they would not do outstanding academic work (note their lower college GPA), and consequently developed much broader interest patterns which are now reflected in the variety of creative activities they are engaged in. Their skills have become those of leadership, salesmanship, influencing others, and seeing opportunities that are feasible, as contrasted with the more intellectually oriented autonomous individual who is seeking elegance of solution and knowledge in depth. The entrepreneurs want to be generalists; the autonomous men want to be specialists. The managerial, technical/functional and security groups do not differ in important ways from each other in terms of intellectual aptitude or performance.

2. Parents' level of education and occupation. Motivational syndromes should be related to parental values and aspirations. We do not have first hand data about the parents of our panelists but we do have some objective information about them such as their educational level and occupation. Table 4 shows the average number of school years completed by the panelists' mothers and fathers and the percentage of them who finished college. In the lower half of the table we show the percentage who fall into broad occupational groupings. For fathers, the business and managerial group includes small business proprietors and salesmen, the professional group includes engineers, lawyers, and dentists, the clerical group includes other white collar jobs, while the "other" group includes a fireman, a detective, and a farmer. For mothers, we show the percent who are housewives, the percent who are or were employed as teachers, social workers, etc.,(prof.) and the percentage who were employed as secretaries or clerks (non-professional).

--Insert Table 4 about here--

Table 4

Fathers' and Mothers' Education and Occupation

	Fathers Educ. Level		Mothers Educ. Level	
	$\bar{x}$ School years	% college grads	$\bar{x}$ school years	% college grads
Managerial Comp.	13.5	50	11.9	0
Tech./Funct. Comp.	15.4	75	13.6	40
Security	12.5	0	13.5	50
Creativity	14.8	60	14.0	40
Autonomy	13.2	50	13.3	33

	Father				Mother		
	% Bus. & Mgr.	% Prof.	% Cler.	% Other	% Prof	% Non-Prof.	% H.W.
Managerial Comp.	75	125	0	12.5	0	12.5	87.5
Tech/Funct.Comp.	60	30	10	0	35	30	35
Security	100	0	0	0	50	0	50
Creativity	80	0	0	20	20	20	60
Autonomy	33	50	0	16	33	0	67

Several interesting patterns emerge. The managerial competence group is average in fathers' education, low in mothers' education, high in business and managerial fathers and high in percentage of housewife mothers. In contrast, the technical/functional competence group is high in fathers' education, high in mothers' education, more diversified in fathers' occupation, and more diversified in mothers' occupations. The security group is low in fathers' education, high in mothers' education, high in percentage of business and managerial fathers, and average in number of housewife mothers. One can conjecture that the security orientation reflects a feeling on the part of the alumnus that once he has gone through graduate school and made it into some level of management he has already climbed higher on the socio-economic ladder than his father.

The creativity group shows high levels of education in both father and mother, and a high percentage of business/managerial fathers. Perhaps the broad interests of this group derive from the breadth that is associated with the higher level of education of both parents. The autonomy group is average as far as parental level of education and mothers' occupation, but stands out in having the lowest percentage of business/managerial fathers and the highest percentage of professional fathers. The autonomy pattern may already have been set in these families in that the fathers' occupations are farmer, associate professor, chief engineer of a company, electrical contractor, (coded as prof.), owner of insurance agency, and Exec. V.P. of family business. Only the latter two jobs are business and managerial and they both involve ownership. None of the fathers are managers in the traditional sense. We do not have enough data to unravel the home influences, but the data suggest that those influences were operating strongly in many of the panelists, lending support to the proposition that career anchors are formed early in life.

3. Religious preference. The religious preference of the panelists is shown in Table 5. We must again remind the reader that the numbers are small and hence can only be treated as suggestive, but some differences do emerge which are consistent with early influences on career anchors. The 23 Protestants in the group tend to be mostly technical/functional and creativity oriented; the 11 Catholics spread evenly over the categories but are proportionately higher in security group; the 9 Jews fall into the managerial, the technical/functional, and autonomy groups, and are percentage wise higher in this latter group.

--Insert Table 5 about here--

Summary. We have tried to ascertain whether the intellectual, socio-economic and religious background of the panelists bears any relationship to the career anchors which have been identified in their current interviews. The small number of cases makes it difficult to do other than draw attention to trends and formulate hypotheses from those trends. The main hypothesis is that there will be early influences on career anchors which should show up in relationships to parental education, occupation, and religion, and that early performance in school should similarly relate to career anchor. The evidence we have shown would support the general hypothesis though we cannot as yet spell out the nature of the mechanisms operating. There are consistent patterns of performance, particularly in the autonomy and creativity groups, and those groups as well as the others show some biases in terms of the educational and occupational statuses of both mother and father. A more detailed analysis of the transcripts of the original interviews should illuminate these findings further, and it will also be possible to go back to the panelists to obtain further data about their childhood, once we have a clearer picture of what questions to ask.

Table 5

Religious Preferences of Career

Anchor Groups

Career Anchor	% Prot.	% Cath.	% Jewish	?
Managerial Comp. (N=8)	37.5	25	37.5	0
Technical/Functional (N=20)	65	20	15	0
Security (N=4)	50	50	0	0
Creativity (N=5)	80	20	0	0
Autonomy (N=7)	14	29	43	14
	N=23	N=11	N=9	N=1

F. Career success of career anchor groups

Success is a complex and difficult variable to define and measure because of the fact that it can be objectively defined by societal standards or subjectively defined by personal standards and goals. In a later analysis we will provide evidence on subjective ratings of success. For the present overview, we will report one indicator of objective success--the income of the panelists, broken down by career anchor groups. Table 6 shows the average income, median income, and income range of the panelists based on their report during the interview. In many cases the numbers are a baseline and exclude annual bonuses, the value of stock options, and other perquisites. In the case of the entrepreneurs we also have to supplement the annual income with figures on the total value of the assets which they say they have accumulated.

--Insert Table 6 about here--

As might be expected the most successful group in pure income terms is the managerial competence group, because the climbing of the managerial ladder is congruent with society's definition of success. The successful entrepreneurs are similarly high if one includes their assets, but even the most successful of them only reports an annual income of 40,000. Perhaps for this group it is more important to build their total assets than to consume what they have amassed. The technical/functional competence group and security group make up the average of the income range in our sample, while the autonomy group is clearly at the low end. As many other studies have shown (Bailyn, et al 1973, Le Jeune 1973) the individuals who leave large organizations to become teachers, writers, and consultants may, in this process sacrifice opportunities for high incomes. However, those consultants and professionals who devleop special areas of knowledge and skill may be

Table 6

Income of Career Anchor Groups

Career Anchor	Mean	Median	Range
Managerial Comp.* (N=8)	37,000	33,500	30,000 - 50,000
Tech./Funct. Comp. (N=20)	26,000	26,000	16,000 - 42,000
Security (N=4)	23,000	24,500	18,000 - 25,000
Creativity** (N=5)	27,000	25,000	17,000 - 40,000
Autonomy (N=7)	19,000	17,000	10,000 - 25,000
Total	26,600	25,000	

* One person has over 50,000 per year in supplemental income from real estate ventures.

** The two successful entrepreneurs report assets in excess of a half million dollars.

expected, at a later time, to rise sharply in income as their talents become better known. In a recent survey of Sloan School alumni conducted in 1973, the graduates of 1958 to 1962 were pulled out as a group (Le Juene, 1973). Their mean income was $26,500 which is virtually identical to the mean income of our group. This similarity supports our earlier claim that we are dealing with a reasonably representative sample of our total alumni pool.

G. Conclusions

In this paper I have tried to introduce and elaborate on the concept of career anchors, viewed as motivational/attitudinal/value syndromes which are formed fairly early in life, and which function to guide and constrain the entire career. Panelists were classified into career anchor groups on the basis of the reasons they gave for career choices, moves from one company to another, what they were looking for in life, how they saw their future, etc. Actual job history and earlier interview data were not used in order to minimize bias. The relationships which we have reported between career anchor, intellectual aptitude, school performance, parental background, religious orientation, current job, and current income are therefore real relationships, i.e. the classification into career anchor groups was made before any of the correlative data were examined.

What has been shown in this analysis is that the concept of career anchor is viable in that it permits a sensible categorization of the panelists. Furthermore, the categories are to some degree psychologically and socio-economically homogeneous. In future papers we will examine the career patterns of the career anchor groups, the patterns of attitudes and values shown during graduate school, and the patterns of attitude and value changes observed during the first 10 to 12 years of the career. For the present we wish to conclude

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

with one or two implications. If career anchors function as stable syndromes in the personality, it becomes crucial for employing organizations to identify those syndromes early and to create career opportunities which are congruent with them. It does little good to offer a promotion into management to someone who basically does not want to be a manager. Organizations will have to learn to think more broadly about the different kinds of contributions which people can make, and to develop multiple reward systems as well as multiple career paths to permit the full development of diverse kinds of individuals who work in organizations.

References

1. Bailyn, L. & Schein, E.H., "Where Are They Now and How Are They Doing?" Technology Review, 1972, 74, p. 7 - 11.

2. Le Jeune, P. Career Paths: A Study of a Sloan School of Management Alumni Sample. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Sloan School of Management, MIT, 1973.

3. Schein, E.H. Problems of the First Year at Work: Report of the First Career Panel Reunion. Sloan School of Management, MIT, Working Paper No. 03-36, 1962.

4. Schein, E.H. Organizational Socialization in the Early Career of Industrial Managers. Sloan School of Management, MIT, Working Paper No. 39-63, 1963.

5. Schein, E.H. How to Break in the College Graduate. Harvard Business Review, 1964, 42, 68-76.